

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-8 are amended, and claims 9-17 are added.

Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 6 can be found, for example, in the specification at page 4, lines 5-8. Claims 2-5, 7 and 8 were amended to comply with the Examiner's request during the interview. Support for new claims 9-17 can be found, for example, in the specification at page 5, lines 20-23. No new matter is added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown by Examiner Bui in the January 3, 2007 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Gisby (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,786). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 1 and 6, and as agreed at the interview, Gisby does not teach a method or apparatus for processing an incoming that, after an incoming call has propagated through a first queue system, selects an optimal recipient for the incoming call and terminates the incoming call if the selected optimal recipient is not available; and then places a virtual call corresponding to the incoming call in one of several parallel queue systems such that the selected second queue system corresponds to the selected optimal recipient.

Gisby teaches a virtual queue 73 system by which a caller 77 is assigned a virtual call 1-7 that is used to keep the caller's 77 place while the caller is free to hang up (col. 7, line 4). As soon as an agent 75 is available, an out dialer 57 connects the caller 77 with the first available agent 75 (col. 7, lines 13-16). As agreed in the interview, after waiting through a first queue system, Gisby does not teach selecting an optimal recipient and, if the selected optimal recipient is not available, placing a virtual call in one of several parallel second queue systems such that the second queue system corresponds to the optimal recipient. Instead, as

pointed out in the interview, Gisby has only a single queue for all agents and connects callers with agents based on whether or not an agent is free (col. 7, lines 13-16) and makes no reference to a second queue.

Therefore, Gisby does not teach the combination of features recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further to the arguments above with respect to claims 1 and 6, with respect to independent claim 12, Gisby does not maintain information on expertise of multiple recipients, determine the nature of business of the incoming call and determine an optimal recipient based on the nature of the incoming call and the expertise of the recipient.

Therefore, for the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 6, as well as the further features recited therein, independent claims 12 and 17 are patentable.

With respect to U.S. Patent No. 5,206,903 to Kohler, mentioned by Examiner Bui during the interview, Kohler does not disclose the combination of features recited in claims 1-17.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:JAR/axl

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Amendment Transmittal
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: January 12, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--